

### REMARKS

Claims 1-44 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-44 stand rejected. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response, Claims 1-44 remain pending in this patent application. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth below.

#### 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

In the above referenced Office Action, Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Ice, U.S. Pat. No. 5,884,031 (hereafter Ice) in view of Ishida, U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,259 (hereafter Ishida). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-44.

Claim 1 recites:

A method of communicating broadcast information comprising the steps of:

a) causing a server to communicate a **first stream representing digital broadcast information** to a first user device wherein said server and said first user device are coupled to the Internet;

b) causing said server to communicate a **second stream representing said broadcast information** to a second user device wherein said second user device is coupled to the Internet;

c) causing said **first user device to communicate a third stream representing said broadcast information to a third user device** wherein said third user device is coupled to the Internet; and

d) **receiving and rendering, concurrently**, said broadcast information on said first, second, and third user devices. (emphasis added)

Ice discloses a network structure having each client device (except a top level of client devices connected to the server) connected to two additional

client devices for receiving information, so that continuity is maintained if a client device goes down, and up to four client devices for disseminating information. (Ice, Col. 2, Lines 23-33).

Unlike Ice, the method of communicating broadcast information of Independent Claim 1 does not impose limits on the communication connections between client devices in the network and provides a wide range of flexibility as to the structure of the network (e.g., the number of levels, the number of client devices at each level, the number of communication connections that a client device has, etc.). In addition, in Independent Claim 1, it is not necessary for the client in a particular level to communicate broadcast information with another client that is in an immediate level above or in an immediate level below, as is required in Ice. Furthermore, in Ice, only the top-level clients communicate broadcast information with the server while in Independent Claim 1 a client at any level can communicate information with either another client or the server.

Moreover, in the case where a first client device stops forwarding the broadcast information to a second client device, the method of communicating broadcast information of Independent Claim 1 responds to this case by establishing a communication connection between the second client device and either another client device or the server which forwards the broadcast information. In sum, the Independent Claim 1 is patentable over Ice and is in a condition for allowance.

user device or the server. In sum, Independent Claim 1 is not obvious over Ice in view of Ishida and is in a condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-7 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over Ice and Ishida. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2-7 are patentable over Ice and Ishida for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 8 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. Therefore, Independent Claim 8 is allowable over Ice and Ishida for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 9-14 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 8, which is allowable over Ice and Ishida. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 9-14 are patentable over Ice and Ishida for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. Therefore, Independent Claim 15 is allowable over Ice and Ishida for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 16-23 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 15, which is allowable over Ice and Ishida. Hence, it is respectfully

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the above remarks overcome all rejections. For at least the above presented reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all remaining claims (Claims 1-44) are now in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: March 7, 2002

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia  
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060